

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R

May 19, 2011

Question Number	Section	Question/Comment	Response
1	B.2	Reference the change in the list of Section B.2 NONPROPOSED COSTS from the Draft RFP to the Final RFP. The Government removed the Training, Consultants, and Facilities lines. Consultants were marked as TBD, but there were values included for Training and Facilities. Is it the Government's intention that the proposing contractor estimate the Training, Consultants, and/or Facilities required in the performance of the contract? If so, does the Government instruct the proposing contractor to add these lines to the Government cost models? And if so, should the costs all be identified in SOW WBS 3.1.1 to be consistent with the presentation of Travel, Equipment, and Other ODCs?	Training, Facilities, and consultant costs should be based on the offeror's proposed approach. Reference the note at the bottom of Enclosure 2 providing the approximate dollar value of consultants/miscellaneous subcontractors. Yes, include the costs in SOW WBS 3.1.1 for consistency.
2	F.1: Enclosure 1	Section F indicates that "Space will be made available for approximately 300 Contractor provided personnel at the GSFC facility." Enclosure 1 indicates that there are 300.4 FTE (Direct Labor) Prime & Significant Subs; and 16 FTE (Consultants /Misc. Subs) for a total of 316.4 FTE. Of the 16 FTE who do not work on-site, how many of these personnel are expected to be telecommuters?	Offerors are expected to propose their approach to address offsite accommodations and technical requirements for all employees proposed to work off-site.
3	L.10(b)1	Is the list of individuals to whom the Past Performance Questionnaires have been sent excluded from the page limit for Volume IV – Past Performance?	No

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R

May 19, 2011

4	L.12.3 Subfactor A – Technical Approach	In the second paragraph, offerors are instructed to "identify the most significant potential risks, as well as management and technical challenges, under this contract..." Shouldn't management risks and challenges be described and, therefore, evaluated under Subfactor B – Management Approach, instead of being evaluated under the Technical Approach?	No, the description of all risks and challenges is to be provided and will be evaluated under Subfactor A.
5	L.12.3 Subfactor B – Management Approach. M.4.1 Subfactor B – Management Approach	At the end of the second paragraph in Section L, there is a requirement to "Include an organizational chart that identifies where this contract fits within the corporate structure." However, Section M does not indicate that where the SESDA contract fits within the corporate structure is going to be evaluated. Will it be evaluated?	Yes, it will be evaluated. The RFP will be amended to add a statement identifying how it will be evaluated.
6	L.12.3 Subfactor B – Management Approach. M.4.1 Subfactor B – Management Approach	Section L (on page 19) requires that "The Offeror shall also address how it will implement delivery schedule management. A description of how priorities will be set and handled as well as how shifting of work will be managed is required." However, Section M (page 42) indicates the government will not only evaluate delivery schedule management, how priorities are set and handled, and how shifting of work will be managed, but also "risk management, quality assurance, obtain user feedback for performance improvement..." Will risk management, quality assurance, and user feedback for performance improvement be evaluated under this proposal topic even though Section L does not instruct Offeror's to address these topics at this location in the proposal?	The RFP will be amended to remove "risk management, quality assurance, obtain user feedback on performance improvement" from this section.

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R
May 19, 2011

7	L.14(b)	The RFP requires that offerors request past performance questionnaires from the customers whose contracts we reference with relevant contract summaries. In situations where our customer for a referenced contract is also known to be a competitor on SESDA III who is submitting a prime bid, our customer is unlikely to be willing to submit a questionnaire. In this circumstance, will Government assess us a neutral evaluation rating for our past performance record?	Per M.6, the Government will assign a neutral rating where there is no record of recent and relevant past performance or the record is unavailable. If the referenced contract is the only relevant and recent contract that an offeror has, and there is no past performance record available on that contract, the offeror would receive a neutral rating. If past performance information is available on other recent and relevant contracts, the Offeror's past performance rating would be assessed based on the available record on those contracts. The Government may obtain past performance information for other sources.
8	L.14(b)	Regarding the past performance questionnaires, the RFP states that "The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance." The use of "questionnaire respondent" as opposed to "questionnaire respondents" suggests that only a single questionnaire needs to be provided per contract reference. Are we to provide a single questionnaire or, alternatively, one questionnaire from a representative from the technical customer, and a second questionnaire from the responsible Contracting Officer?	One questionnaire from each respondent.
9	L.14(b)	This paragraph requires the offeror to instruct each of its respondents to return the Past Performance Questionnaire "directly to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Contracting Officer." Since the Past Performance Questionnaire in Exhibit 11 includes not only a mailing address, but also an FAX number and email address, will it be acceptable for the Government to receive these questionnaires via FAX as well as email?	Yes

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R
May 19, 2011

10	M.4.1	<p>This paragraph indicates that the Government will evaluate topics that RFP Section L instructions for the Questions/Scenarios state that "Rather than duplicating materials, responses should refer to the Offeror's pertinent capabilities in their response to the SOW requirements to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; support methodology proposed; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution." With this Section L instruction, it appears that the Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the objectives: support methodology proposed; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution will be evaluated as part of the evaluation of the Understanding of the Requirements of the Statement of Work, as opposed to being evaluated under the Questions/Scenarios. Please clarify where our understanding of the objectives: support methodology proposed; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution will be evaluated.</p>	<p>Responses to the SOW requirements and the Questions/Scenarios will be evaluated under Mission Suitability, Subfactor A Technical Approach.</p>
11	Exhibit 11	<p>Can this Past Performance Questionnaire be provided in a Microsoft Word file format so that contract references may complete the forms using Word?</p>	<p>The past Performance Questionnaire was provided in Microsoft Word format (docx) in Exhibit 11.</p>

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R
May 19, 2011

12	Enclosure 1: Enclosure 2	In comparing these enclosures, we noted that while labor categories are listed in Enclosure 1 for Network Engineer, Senior and Technician, Associate, these are not listed in Enclosure 2. We also note in Enclosure 1 that zero FTE are listed for the following labor categories: Technician, Associate; Technician, Principal; Technician; and Test Engineer, Associate. Yet average unloaded direct labor hourly rates are provided in Enclosure 2 only for Technician, Principal; Technician; and Test Engineer, Associate. Should an average unloaded direct labor hourly rate for Technician, Associate also be included in Enclosure 2?	Network Engineer, Senior is not a direct labor position but rather a consultant and therefore was not included in Enclosure 2. Technician, Associate was inadvertently included in Enclosure 1. Enclosure 1 will be updated to remove that labor category. Due to rounding, the FTE count for Technician, Principal; Technician; and Test Engineer, Associate are shown as zero; the Government estimate includes an insignificant amount of work performed in each of these labor categories.
13	Enclosure 1, 3.3.1; Attachment A: SOW 3.3.2	The SOW for Proposals and Scientific Documentation Support includes "the editing function for revising and updating documents, coordinating the physical production, and distribution of various technical and mission documents." However, Enclosure 1, includes estimated labor only for Principal Engineer; Scientific Software Developer; Senior Software Engineer; Principal Support Scientist; and Associate Systems Engineer. Aren't documentation specialist hours required to support this SOW element as well?	The scope of individual Work Activity Plans (WAPs) often span two or more Functional Areas (FAs). FTEs supporting the WAPs may also span multiple Functional Areas. While it is possible that some FTE counts may not be fully represented in each Functional Area, they are fully represented when taking the SOW as a whole. Offerers are encouraged to propose labor categories appropriate for their approach to satisfy the SOW based on their understanding of the requirements.

Questions and Responses #2 to Final RFP NNG11341433R
May 19, 2011

14	Attachment A: SOW 3.1.4 and SOW 3.1.7	SOW 3.1.4 states "The mission ground support requires the Contractor to support ground systems development and operations..." SOW 3.1.7 states "Activities requiring support include planning of mission science operations, data acquisition and distribution, data processing and development of mission data systems..." Both SOW areas appear to require development and operations, for example science instrument planning operations. Please clarify the differences between these two SOW areas.	As stated in Attachment A, SOW 3.1.4 requires support for ground systems and SOW 3.1.7 requires support for mission science operations.
15	Attachment C	Will the Government provide on-site facility space (power, HVAC, racks, UPS) for the Government Furnished Property (GFP), such as disk arrays and servers that are currently housed off-site under SESDA II, or is the offeror expected to provide off-site facility space to house all of the GFP?	Offerors are expected to provide offsite facility space for all proposed GFE. The Government may be able to provide onsite facility space if available and if proposed by an Offeror, but only if deemed to be in the best interest of the Government.
16	Attachment C	Has the Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI) equipment for the OMI Science Investigator-led processing Systems (SIPS) been moved onsite at GSFC or will it still be required to be operated at the SESDA III contractor off-site facility?	OMI SIPS equipment is currently located at the incumbent contractor's offsite facility but are not required to operate there. Offerors may propose any solution they feel is in the best interest of the Government.